Sparse Signal Recovery Using gOMP Assisted mOLS

Samrat Mukhopadhyay[1], Siddhartha Satpathi[2] and Mrityunjoy Chakraborty[3]
Department of Electronics and Electrical Communication Engineering,
Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur, INDIA
Email: [1]samratphysics@gmail.com,[2]sidd.piku@gmail.com, [3]mrityun@ece.iitkgp.ernet.in

arXiv:1511.08575v2 [cs.IT] 2 Nov 2016

***Abstract*—Because of fast convergence in finite number of steps and low computational complexity, signal recovery from compressed measurements using greedy algorithms have generated a large amount of interest in recent years. Among these greedy algorithms OMP is well studied and recently its generalization, gOMP, have also drawn attention. On the other hand OLS and its generalization mOLS have been studied in recent years because of their potential advantages in signal recovery guarantee compared to OMP or gOMP. But OLS and mOLS have the shortcomings of high computational complexity. In this paper we propose a new algorithm which uses gOMP to preselect a N length set out of which mOLS selects its L best coefficients. We have shown that our new algorithm, named m^{2}OLS, is guaranteed to reconstruct a K sparse signals perfectly from compressed measurements if the restricted isometry constant satisfies $\delta_{LK+N} < \frac{\sqrt{L}}{\sqrt{L}+\sqrt{K+L}}$. Moreover experimental results indicate that m^{2}OLS is robust under sensing matrix with correlated dictionary in terms of signal reconstruction and is much faster than OLS.**

***Index Terms*—Compressive Sensing, gOMP, mOLS, restricted isometry property**

I. Introduction

There has been considerable interest for some time to recover signals from their partial measurements. Mathematically the problem can be expressed as finding solution for the following set of linear equations

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{\Phi x}$$

where $\mathbf{\Phi} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ and $m < n$. Since this is an undetermined set of linear equations, the number of solutions is infinite, without further information about structure of $\mathbf{x}$. A natural problem that then follows is to find solutions for these set of equations which has the lowest *sparsity* i.e. lowest number of nonzero elements, i.e the constarined l_0 norm minimization problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n} \|\mathbf{x}\|_0$$
$$\text{s.t. } \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{\Phi x}$$

However, this problem requires combinatorial search which is computationally intractable. The way out to this problem was found by Candes and Tao [1] in a seminal paper where it was shown that the l_0 norm can be solved *exactly* using l_1 norm optimization if the number of measurements is $\mathcal{O}(K \ln n)$ where K is the sparsity of the vector $\mathbf{x}$. The problem that is required to solve under this condition is

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n} \|\mathbf{x}\|_1$$
$$\text{s.t. } \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{\Phi x}$$

This is called the *basis pursuit*(BP) [2]. This can be solved by standard Linear programming approach.

A. Greedy approaches

Linear programming approach has cubic complexity on the number of columns n, which can be too slow for large n (~ 1000 is common in many applications). In that case greedy approaches play the role of useful alternatives. A greedy algorithm utilizes some greedy rule to reconstruct the vector at each step of the algorithm. They are often faster than LP. Orthogonal Matching Pursuit(OMP) [3][4], Orthogonal Least Squares(OLS) [5][6] are among the earliest of these greedy algorithms. These algorithms greedily select indices at each step of the algorithm and append them to the already constructed support create a succesively increasing support over which they take projections to get reconstructed signal. The only difference between these two algorithms is in the method of selecting an index in the identification step. At an iteration k OMP chooses an index i which maximizes the absolute correlation $\left\langle \mathbf{r^{k-1}}, \phi_i \right\rangle$ where $\mathbf{r}^{k-1}$ is the residual error vector at step $k-1$ and ϕ_i is a column of the measurement matrix $\mathbf{\Phi}$. In OLS the identification is performed by choosing an index i which would minimize the resulting residual vector norm. Wang *et al* introduced gOMP algorithm [7] and mOLS algorithm [8] as generalizations of OMP and OLS algorithms respectively. In gOMP and mOLS in the identification step, the algorithms choose multiple instead of single index. See Table. I for details.

The motivation for introducing both gOMP as well as mOLS is that the time complexity of the algorithms can be markedly improved if at each iteration the algorithms choose multiple indices instead of just one. This increases the probability of choosing a correct index at an iteration and hence, for a given sparse signal with sparsity K, the algorithms converge faster than OMP or OLS. Wang *et al* [7] has shown that the computational complexity for OMP is about $2Kmn + 3K^2m$ floating point operations per second(flops) where $m \times n$ is the size of the measurement matrix and the computational complexity of gOMP is about $2smn + (2N^2 + N)s^2m$ flops where N is the number of indices that gOMP chooses at a time at each iteration and s is the number of iterations required for the algorithm to stop. By extensive simulation they have shown that gOMP indeed takes a small number of simulation s to recover the K sparse signal which effectively reduces its computational complexity. Similar conclusions are drawn for mOLS compared to OLS by Wang *et al* [8] through extensive simulations. Other algorithms of the same flavour

TABLE I: gOMP AND mOLS ALGORITHM

(a) gOMP ALGORITHM

Input: measurement vector $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m$, sensing matrix $\mathbf{\Phi} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, sparsity level K, total set $\mathcal{H} = \{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$
Initialize: counter $k = 0$, residue $\mathbf{r}^0 = \mathbf{y}$, estimated support set, $T^0 = \emptyset$
While ($\|\mathbf{r}_k\|_2 \geq \epsilon$ and $k < K$)
$k = k + 1$
Identify: h^k is the set containing indices corresponding to the N largest absolute entries of $\mathbf{\Phi}^t \mathbf{r}^{k-1}$
Augment: $T^k = T^{k-1} \cup h^k$
Estimate: $\mathbf{x}^k = \underset{\mathbf{u}:\mathbf{u}\in\mathbb{R}^n,\ supp(\mathbf{u})=T^k}{\arg\min} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{\Phi}\mathbf{u}\|_2$
Update: $\mathbf{r}^k = \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{\Phi}\mathbf{x}^k$
End While

Output: estimated support set $\hat{T} = \underset{S:|S|=K}{\arg\min} \|\mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{x}^k_S\|_2$ and K-sparse signal $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ satisfying $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\hat{T}} = \mathbf{x}^k_{\hat{T}},\ \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathcal{H}\setminus\hat{T}} = \mathbf{0}$

(b) mOLS ALGORITHM

Input: measurement vector $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m$, sensing matrix $\mathbf{\Phi} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, sparsity level K, total set $\mathcal{H} = \{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$
Initialize: counter $k = 0$, residue $\mathbf{r}^0 = \mathbf{y}$, estimated support set, $T^0 = \emptyset$
While ($\|\mathbf{r}_k\|_2 \geq \epsilon$ and $k < K$)
$k = k + 1$
Identify: $h^k = \underset{S:S\subset\mathcal{H},|S|=L}{\arg\min} \sum_{i\in S} \|\mathbf{P}^{\perp}_{T^{k-1}\cup\{i\}}\mathbf{y}\|_2^2$
Augment: $T^k = T^{k-1} \cup h^k$
Estimate: $\mathbf{x}^k = \underset{\mathbf{u}:\mathbf{u}\in\mathbb{R}^n,\ supp(\mathbf{u})=T^k}{\arg\min} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{\Phi}\mathbf{u}\|_2$
Update: $\mathbf{r}^k = \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{\Phi}\mathbf{x}^k$
End While

Output: estimated support set $\hat{T} = \underset{S:|S|=K}{\arg\min} \|\mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{x}^k_S\|_2$ and K-sparse signal $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ satisfying $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\hat{T}} = \mathbf{x}^k_{\hat{T}},\ \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathcal{H}\setminus\hat{T}} = \mathbf{0}$

as gOMP or mOLS are stagewise OMP(StOMP) [9], regularized OMP(ROMP) [10], Compressed Sampling Matching Pursuit(CoSaMP) [11] and Subspace Pursuit (SP) [12]. OMP has been the representative of these algorithms because of its simplicity and recovery performance. Tropp and Gilbert [4] have shown that OMP can recover the original sparse vector from a few measurements with exceedingly high probability when the measurement matrix has entries i.i.d Gaussian. But recently Soussen *et al* [13] have shown that OLS performs considerably better than OMP in recovering sparse signals from few measurements when the measurement matrix has correlated entries. They have also shown that there exists measurement dictionaries for which OMP fails to recover the original signal whereas OLS is unaffected.

B. Our contributions in this paper

- In this paper we propose a new algorithm, referred to as m^{2}OLS (short for *gOMP assisted mOLS*), that exploits the capability of gOMP to select "good" indices at a step as well as the robustness of mOLS in maintaining high recovery performance in the presence measurement matrices with correlated dictionaries.
- We find a criteria under which our proposed algorithm can exactly recover the unknown K-sparse signal which is based upon the *restricted isometry property* of the measurement matrix. A matrix $\mathbf{\Phi} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ is said to have restricted isometry property (RIP) of order K if $\exists\ \delta > 0$ such that $\forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with sparsity K, the matrix $\mathbf{\Phi}$ satisfies the following inequalities

$$(1-\delta)\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \leq \|\mathbf{\Phi}\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \leq (1+\delta)\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2$$

  The smallest δ for which this property is satisfied is called the restricted isometry constant of order K of the matrix $\mathbf{\Phi}$ and is denoted by δ_K. We show that m^{2}OLS with gOMP selecting N indices and mOLS selecting $L \leq N$ indices (See Table. II for details of the algorithm) is guaranteed to recover a K sparse vector exactly from compressed measurements if the matrix $\mathbf{\Phi}$ obeys RIP with constant

$$\delta_{LK+N} < \frac{\sqrt{L}}{\sqrt{K+L}+\sqrt{L}}$$

- We compare simulation results for recovery performances of OMP, OLS and m^{2}OLS and show that m^{2}OLS performs much better than OMP in recovering sparse vector for measurement matrices with correlated dictionary. Also, gOMPmaOLS is much faster than OLS and thus becomes a suitable upgradation of both OMP and OLS.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Notation

The following notation will be used throughout the paper.

- $\|\cdot\|_p$ denotes the l^p norm of a vector $\mathbf{v}$, i.e., $\|\mathbf{v}\|_p = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |v_i|^p\right)^{1/p}$
- $\mathbf{\Phi} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ will denote the measurement matrix with m rows and n columns with $m < n$
- The i th column of $\mathbf{\Phi}$ will be denoted by $\phi_i;\ i = 1, 2, \cdots, n$. All the columns of $\mathbf{\Phi}$ are assumed to have unit l_2 norm.
- K will denote the sparsity level estimated beforehand
- $\mathbf{x}_S$ will denote the vector $\mathbf{x}$ restricted to a subset $S \subset \{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$. Similarly, $\mathbf{\Phi}_S$ will denote the submatrix of $\mathbf{\Phi}$ formed with the columns restricted to index set S
- $\mathcal{H}$ will denote the set of all the indices $\{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$
- T will refer to the support set of the original vector $\mathbf{x}$
- If $\mathbf{\Phi}_S$ has column rank $|S|$ ($|S| < m$), then $\mathbf{\Phi}^{\dagger}_S = (\mathbf{\Phi}^t_S\mathbf{\Phi}_S)^{-1}\mathbf{\Phi}^t_S$ will denote the Moore-Penrose pseudo-inverse of $\mathbf{\Phi}_S$
- $\mathbf{P}_S = \mathbf{\Phi}_S\mathbf{\Phi}^{\dagger}_S$ will denote the projection operator on $span(\mathbf{\Phi}_S)$ and $\mathbf{P}^{\perp}_S = \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_S$ will denote the projection operator on the orthogonal complement of $span(\mathbf{\Phi}_S)$
- $\mathbf{A}_\Lambda$ is defined, for any $\Lambda \subset \mathcal{H}$, $\mathbf{A}_\Lambda = \mathbf{P}^{\perp}_{\Lambda}\mathbf{\Phi}_\Lambda$

B. Lemmas

The following lemmas will be useful for analysis of our algorithm.

Lemma 2.1 (monotonicity of RIC, Lemma 1 of [12])**.** *If a measurement matrix satisfies RIP of orders K_1, K_2 and $K_1 \leq K_2$, then $\delta_{K_1} \leq \delta_{K_2}$.*

Lemma 2.2 (Lemma 1 of [12])**.** *If $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a vector with support S_1, and $S_1 \cap S_2 = \emptyset$, then,*

$$\|\mathbf{\Phi}_{S_1}^t \mathbf{\Phi}\mathbf{x}\|_2 \leq \delta_{|S_1|+|S_2|}\|\mathbf{x}\|_2$$

Lemma 2.3 (Lemma 3 of [14])**.** *If $I_1, I_2 \subset \mathcal{H}$ such that $I_1 \cap I_2 = \emptyset$, then, $\forall \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $supp(\mathbf{u}) \subset I_2$,*

$$\left(1 - \left(\frac{\delta_{|I_1|+|I_2|}}{1-\delta_{|I_1|+|I_2|}}\right)^2\right)\|\mathbf{\Phi}\mathbf{u}\|_2^2 \leq \|\mathbf{A}_{I_1}\mathbf{u}\|_2^2 \leq (1+\delta_{|I_1|+|I_2|})\|\mathbf{\Phi}\mathbf{u}\|_2^2$$

and,

$$\left(1 - \frac{\delta_{|I_1|+|I_2|}}{1-\delta_{|I_1|+|I_2|}}\right)\|\mathbf{u}\|_2^2 \leq \|\mathbf{A}_{I_1}\mathbf{u}\|_2^2 \leq (1+\delta_{|I_1|+|I_2|})\|\mathbf{u}\|_2^2$$

III. Proposed Algorithm

TABLE II: m^{2}OLS Algorithm

Input: measurement vector $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m$, sensing matrix $\mathbf{\Phi} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$, sparsity level K, true support set $T = supp(\mathbf{x})$, total set $\mathcal{H} = \{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$, $L \leq N, L \leq K$

Initialize: counter $k = 0$, residue $\mathbf{r}^0 = \mathbf{y}$, estimated support set, $T^0 = \emptyset$, set selected by gOMP $S^0 = \emptyset$,

While ($\|\mathbf{r}_k\|_2 \geq \epsilon$ and $k < K$)

$k = k + 1$

Preselect: S^k is the set containing indices corresponding to the N largest absolute entries of $\mathbf{\Phi}^t\mathbf{r}^{k-1}$

Identify: $h^k = \underset{\Lambda\subset S^k:|\Lambda|=L}{\arg\min} \sum_{i\in\Lambda} \|\mathbf{P}_{T^{k-1}\cup\{i\}}^{\perp}\mathbf{y}\|_2^2$

Augment: $T^k = T^{k-1} \cup h^k$

Estimate: $\mathbf{x}^k = \underset{\mathbf{u}:\mathbf{u}\in\mathbb{R}^n,\ supp(\mathbf{u})=T^k}{\arg\min} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{\Phi}\mathbf{u}\|_2$

Update: $\mathbf{r}^k = \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{\Phi}\mathbf{x}^k$

End While

Output: estimated support set $\hat{T} = \underset{S:|S|=K}{\arg\min} \|\mathbf{x}^k - \mathbf{x}_S^k\|_2$ and K-sparse signal $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ satisfying $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\hat{T}} = \mathbf{x}_{\hat{T}}^k,\ \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathcal{H}\setminus\hat{T}} = \mathbf{0}$

Our proposed algorithm is described in Table. II. It is different from the conventional mOLS algorithm (described in Table. Ib) in the identification step as well as a new step, that we call *preselection*. A conventional mOLS algorithm searches for the new index in $\mathcal{H}$. This search procedure is conducted by going to each index and measuring the norm of residue if this index were used in the augmentation step. The L indices which give the minimum residue norms arranged in ascending order, are chosen. For large n, this step itself is computationally expensive. We modify this step by breaking it into a preselection step and an identification step. The preselection step uses gOMP (descried in Table. Ia) to contract the set of potential candidates to a set of cardinality $N(< n)$, choosing the indices corresponding to the N largest coordinates of $\mathbf{\Phi}^t\mathbf{r}^{k-1}$, norm wise. The resulting set is then considered for the mOLS identification step.

IV. Signal recovery using m^{2}OLS algorithm:without noise

We seek the conditions under which m^{2}OLS algorithm is guaranteed to recover a K-sparse signal within K iterations. We say that m^{2}OLS algorithm makes a success at an iteration if it selects at least one correct index at that iteration. Now, the identification step in the m^{2}OLS algorithm can be expressed in a way convenient to our analysis by the virtue of the following lemma

Lemma 4.1. *At the $(k+1)th$ iteration, the identification step chooses the set*

$$h^{k+1} = \underset{S:S\subset S^{k+1},|S|=L}{\arg\max} \sum_{i\in S} \frac{|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k\rangle|^2}{\|\mathbf{P}_{T^k}^{\perp}\phi_i\|_2^2}$$

Moreover, if

$$g^{k+1} = \underset{S:S\subset S^{k+1},|S|=L}{\arg\max} \sum_{i\in S} \frac{|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k\rangle|}{\|\mathbf{P}_{T^k}^{\perp}\phi_i\|_2}$$

, then,

$$\sum_{i\in h^{k+1}} \frac{|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k\rangle|}{\|\mathbf{P}_{T^k}^{\perp}\phi_i\|_2} = \sum_{i\in g^{k+1}} \frac{|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k\rangle|}{\|\mathbf{P}_{T^k}^{\perp}\phi_i\|_2}$$

Proof: This lemma is a direct consequence of Proposition 1 of [8]. Nevertheless we provide a different proof in Appendix A that utilizes properties of a vector space. ■

1) Success at the first iteration: The preselection step gives the set S^1 which consists of the indices corresponding to the N largest coordinates of $\mathbf{\Phi}^t\mathbf{y}$. Now, $k = 0 \implies \|\mathbf{P}_{T^k}^{\perp}\phi_i\|_2 = \|\phi_i\|_2 = 1$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} T^1 &= h^1 \\ &= \underset{S\subset S^1:|S|=L}{\arg\max} \sum_{i\in S} \frac{|\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^0\rangle|^2}{\|\mathbf{P}_{T^k}^{\perp}\phi_i\|_2^2} \\ &= \underset{S\subset S^1:|S|=L}{\arg\max} \sum_{i\in S} |\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{y}\rangle|^2 \\ &= \underset{S\subset S^1:|S|=L}{\arg\max} \|\mathbf{\Phi}_S^t\mathbf{y}\|_2^2 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

So,

$$\|\mathbf{\Phi}_{T^1}^t\mathbf{y}\| = \max_{S\subset S^1:|S|=L} \|\mathbf{\Phi}_S^t\mathbf{y}\|_2 \tag{2}$$

Now we make the following observations and state them in the form of the following lemma:

Lemma 4.2.

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\|\mathbf{\Phi}_{S^1}^t\mathbf{y}\|_2 \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}}\|\mathbf{\Phi}_T^t\mathbf{y}\|_2, \quad (N \leq K) \tag{3}$$

$$\|\mathbf{\Phi}_{S^1}^t\mathbf{y}\|_2 \geq \|\mathbf{\Phi}_T^t\mathbf{y}\|_2, \quad (N > K) \tag{4}$$

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{L}}\|\mathbf{\Phi}_{T^1}^t\mathbf{y}\|_2 \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}}\|\mathbf{\Phi}_T^t\mathbf{y}\|_2 \tag{5}$$

Proof: The proof is postponed to Appendix. A. ■

Now, we find the recovery conditions separately for the cases $N \leq K$ and $N > K$.

1) When $N \leq K$, In this case, we have, from Eq. 3

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{S^1}\mathbf{y}\|_2 &\geq \sqrt{\frac{N}{K}}\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_T\mathbf{y}\|_2 \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{N}{K}}\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_T\mathbf{\Phi}_T\mathbf{x}_T\|_2 \\ &\geq \sqrt{\frac{N}{K}}(1-\delta_K)\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Now if no correct index were selected in S^1, then the first iteration is bound to fail. Then

$$\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{S^1}\mathbf{y}\|_2 = \|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{S^1}\mathbf{\Phi}_T\mathbf{x}_T\|_2 \leq \delta_{K+N}\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \tag{7}$$

So, S^1 is guaranteed to contain at least one correct index if

$$\begin{aligned} &\delta_{K+N} < \sqrt{\frac{N}{K}}(1-\delta_K) \\ \implies &\sqrt{K}\delta_{K+N} + \sqrt{N}\delta_K < \sqrt{N} \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

2) When $N > K$, the observations in Eq. (4) is valid. Hence, after performing a series of deductions similar to the case $N \leq K$, we get the following sufficient condition for S^1 to contain at least one correct index:

$$\delta_{K+N} + \delta_K < 1 \tag{9}$$

In both the cases, Eq. (5) is valid, from which we get

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{T^1}\mathbf{y}\right\|_2 \geq &\sqrt{\frac{L}{K}}\left\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_T\mathbf{y}\right\|_2 \\ = &\sqrt{\frac{L}{K}}\left\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_T\mathbf{\Phi}_T\mathbf{x}\right\|_2 \\ \geq &\sqrt{\frac{L}{K}}(1-\delta_K)\left\|\mathbf{x}\right\|_2 \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Even if S^1 consists of at least one correct index, a correct index may not be selected at the first iteration. Then

$$\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{T^1}\mathbf{y}\|_2 = \|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{T^1}\mathbf{\Phi}_T\mathbf{x}_T\|_2 \leq \delta_{K+L}\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \tag{11}$$

Thus sufficient condition for success in the first iteration, given the condition in Eq. (8) or Eq.(9) is guaranteed by

$$\begin{aligned} &\delta_{K+L} < \sqrt{\frac{L}{K}}(1-\delta_K) \\ \implies &\sqrt{K}\delta_{K+L} + \sqrt{L}\delta_K < \sqrt{L} \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Now, if we have

$$\delta_{N+K} < \frac{\sqrt{L}}{\sqrt{L}+\sqrt{K}} \tag{13}$$

then, since $L \leq N$, by monotonicity $\delta_{L+K} \leq \delta_{N+K} < \frac{\sqrt{L}}{\sqrt{L}+\sqrt{K}}$ and thus the inequality in Eq. (12) is satisfied. Also, since $L \leq N$, under the condition in Eq. (13), $\delta_{N+K} < \frac{\sqrt{L}}{\sqrt{L}+\sqrt{K}} \leq \frac{\sqrt{N}}{\sqrt{N}+\sqrt{K}}$. So, if $N \leq K$, inequality in Eq. (8) is satisfied. Further, if $N > K$, it is easy to see that the inequality in Eq. (9) is satisfied under the condition in Eq. (13), since $L \leq K$. Thus under the condition in Eq. (13) the first iteration is guaranteed to succeed.



Fig. 1: Venn diagram for S^{k+1}, T, T^k

2) Success at the $(k+1)$th iteration ($k > 0$): We assume that the algorithm selects at least one index at each of the previous $k(\geq 1)$ iterations. Let $|T \cap T^k| = c_k$. Then by the induction hypothesis, $c_k \geq k$. Also, let that not all the correct indices are recovered, i.e. $c_k < K$. Also, we define $m_k := |S_k \cap T|,\ \forall k \geq 1$. Thus if the i th iteration succeeded, $m_i \geq 1$. The necessary conditions for the success of the $(k+1)$th iteration are the following:

$$S^{k+1} \cap T \neq \emptyset \tag{14}$$

$$h^{k+1} \cap T \neq \emptyset \tag{15}$$

We will find the sufficient conditions that would ensure these.
Conditions to ensure Eq. (14): We introduce the notation necessary in the analysis henceforth. The notation is drawn from [7] and [14]. We denote

$$\beta^k_1 = \max_{i \in T} |\left\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \right\rangle|^2 \tag{16}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha^k_N = &\min_{i \in W^{k+1}} |\left\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \right\rangle|^2 \text{ where} \\ W^{k+1} := &\underset{S \subset \mathcal{H} \setminus T : |S| = N}{\arg\max} \|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_S \mathbf{r}^k\|_2^2 \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

Then at $(k+1)$th iteration, we can see that the set S^{k+1} is guaranteed to consist of at least one index from T if we have $\beta^k_1 > \alpha^k_N$. We can find a condition for this along the lines of [14].

As noted in [14], it can be seen that $\mathbf{r}^k \in Span(\mathbf{\Phi}_{T \cup T^k})$. This is because, looking at the relationship between T, T^k in Fig. 1 and keeping in mind the property of the projection operator, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{r}^k =&\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{\Phi}_{T^k}\mathbf{\Phi}^\dagger_{T^k}\mathbf{y} \\ =&\mathbf{\Phi}_T\mathbf{x}_T - \mathbf{P}_{T^k}\mathbf{\Phi}_T\mathbf{x}_T \\ =&(\mathbf{\Phi}_{T\cap T^k}\mathbf{x}_{T\cap T^k} + \mathbf{\Phi}_{T\setminus T^k}\mathbf{x}_{T\setminus T^k}) \\ &- \mathbf{P}_{T^k}(\mathbf{\Phi}_{T\cap T^k}\mathbf{x}_{T\cap T^k} + \mathbf{\Phi}_{T\setminus T^k}\mathbf{x}_{T\setminus T^k}) \\ =&(\mathbf{\Phi}_{T\cap T^k}\mathbf{x}_{T\cap T^k} + \mathbf{\Phi}_{T\setminus T^k}\mathbf{x}_{T\setminus T^k}) \\ &- \mathbf{\Phi}_{T\cap T^k}\mathbf{x}_{T\cap T^k} - \mathbf{P}_{T^k}\mathbf{\Phi}_{T\setminus T^k}\mathbf{x}_{T\setminus T^k} \\ =&\mathbf{\Phi}_{T\setminus T^k}\mathbf{x}_{T\setminus T^k} - \mathbf{\Phi}_{T^k}\mathbf{u}_{T^k} \\ =&\mathbf{\Phi}_{T^k\cup T}\mathbf{x}'_{T^k\cup T} \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where

$$\mathbf{x}'_{T^k\cup T} = \begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{x}_{T\setminus T^k} \\ -\mathbf{u}_{T^k}\end{bmatrix} \tag{19}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_N^k &= \min_{i\in W^{k+1}} |\left\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k\right\rangle|^2 \\ &\le \frac{\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{W^{k+1}}\mathbf{r}^k\|_2^2}{N} \\ &= \frac{\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{W^{k+1}\setminus T^k}\mathbf{r}^k\|_2^2}{N} \ (\because \mathbf{\Phi}^t_{T^k}\mathbf{r}^k = 0) \\ &= \frac{\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{W^{k+1}\setminus T^k}\mathbf{\Phi}_{T\cup T^k}\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\|_2^2}{N} \\ &\le \frac{1}{N}\delta^2_{Lk+K-c_k+N}\|\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\|^2 \\ &\le \frac{1}{N}\delta^2_{LK+N}\|\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\|^2 \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

The last two steps use the facts that $|W^{k+1}\setminus T^k \cup (T\cup T^k)| = |W^{k+1}\setminus T^k| + |T\cup T^k| \le N + Lk + K - c_k$ and that $c_k \ge k,\ k \le K$ along with the monotonic increasing property of RIC.

To find a lower bound of β_1^k, we proceed as follows

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_1^k &= \|\mathbf{\Phi}_T^t\mathbf{r}^k\|_\infty^2 \\ &\ge \frac{\|\mathbf{\Phi}_T^t\mathbf{r}^k\|_2^2}{K} \\ &= \frac{1}{K}\|[\mathbf{\Phi}_T \quad \mathbf{\Phi}_{T^k\setminus T}]^t\mathbf{r}^k\|_2^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{K}\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{T\cup T^k}\mathbf{\Phi}_{T\cup T^k}\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\|_2^2 \\ &\ge \frac{1}{K}(1-\delta_{Lk+K-c_k})^2\|\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\|_2^2 \\ &\ge \frac{1}{K}(1-\delta_{LK+N})^2\|\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\|_2^2 \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

where the last step follows from the monotonic increasing property of RIC along with the observation that that $Lk+K-c_k \le Lk+K-k \le (K-1)(L-1)+K = LK-(L-1) \le LK+N$, which follows since $c_k \ge k, k < K$, and $N \ge L$. Thus from Eq. (20) and Eq. (21) we see that

$$\delta_{LK+N} < \frac{\sqrt{N}}{\sqrt{K}+\sqrt{N}} \tag{22}$$

will assure that atleast one correct index from T is chosen in S^{k+1}.

Condition to ensure Eq. (15): Eq. (22) guarantees $m_{k+1} = |T\cap S^{k+1}| \ge 1$. Now, along the lines of [8] let us define

$$u_1 = \max_{i\in S^{k+1}\cap T} \frac{|\left\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k\right\rangle|}{\|\mathbf{P}^\perp_{T^k}\phi_i\|_2} \tag{23}$$

$$v_L = \min_{i\in V^{k+1}} \frac{|\left\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k\right\rangle|}{\|\mathbf{P}^\perp_{T^k}\phi_i\|_2} \text{ where}$$
$$V^{k+1} = \underset{S\subset S^{k+1}\setminus T:|S|=L}{\arg\max} \sum_{i\in S} \frac{|\left\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k\right\rangle|^2}{\|\mathbf{P}^\perp_{T^k}\phi_i\|_2^2} \tag{24}$$

Then if we can ensure that $u_1 > v_L$, we can ensure the condition in Eq. (15).

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}u_1 &= \max_{i\in S^{k+1}\cap T} \frac{|\left\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k\right\rangle|}{\|\mathbf{P}^\perp_{T^k}\phi_i\|_2} \\ &\ge \max_{i\in S^{k+1}\cap T} |\left\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k\right\rangle| \\ &\ge \frac{\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{S^{k+1}\cap T}\mathbf{r}^k\|_2}{\sqrt{m_{k+1}}} \\ &\ge \frac{\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{T\setminus T^k}\mathbf{r}^k\|_2}{\sqrt{K-c_k}} \end{aligned}$$

The argument behind last step is as follows: Since $S^{k+1}\cap T^k = \emptyset$, and $S^{k+1}\cap T \subset T\setminus T^k$, we find

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{T\setminus T^k}\mathbf{r}^k\right\|_2^2 \\ &= \left\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{S^{k+1}\cap T}\mathbf{r}^k\right\|_2^2 + \left\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{T\setminus(S^{k+1}\cup T^k)}\mathbf{r}^k\right\|_2^2 \\ &\le \left\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{S^{k+1}\cap T}\mathbf{r}^k\right\|_2^2 + (K-c_k-m_{k+1}) \max_{i\in T\setminus(S^{k+1}\cup T^k)} \left|\left\langle \boldsymbol{\phi}_i, \mathbf{r}^k\right\rangle\right|^2 \\ &\le \left\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{S^{k+1}\cap T}\mathbf{r}^k\right\|_2^2 + (K-c_k-m_{k+1}) \min_{i\in S^{k+1}\cap T} \left|\left\langle \boldsymbol{\phi}_i, \mathbf{r}^k\right\rangle\right|^2 \\ &\le \left\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{S^{k+1}\cap T}\mathbf{r}^k\right\|_2^2 + \frac{K-c_k-m_{k+1}}{m_{k+1}}\left\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{S^{k+1}\cap T}\mathbf{r}^k\right\|_2^2 \\ &= \frac{K-c_k}{m_{k+1}}\left\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{S^{k+1}\cap T}\mathbf{r}^k\right\|_2^2 \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{T\setminus T^k}\mathbf{r}^k\|_2 &= \|[\mathbf{\Phi}_{T\setminus T^k} \quad \mathbf{\Phi}_{T^k}]^t\mathbf{r}^k\|_2 \\ &= \|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{T\cup T^k}\mathbf{\Phi}_{T\cup T^k}\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\|_2 \\ &\ge (1-\delta_{LK+N-1})\|\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\|_2 \text{(From 21)} \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

Hence

$$u_1 \ge \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}}(1-\delta_{LK+N})\|\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\|_2 \tag{26}$$

On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned}v_L &= \min_{i\in V^{k+1}} \frac{|\left\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k\right\rangle|}{\|\mathbf{P}^\perp_{T^k}\phi_i\|_2} \\ &\le \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}}\sqrt{\sum_{i\in V^{k+1}} \frac{|\left\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k\right\rangle|^2}{\|\mathbf{P}^\perp_{T^k}\phi_i\|_2^2}} \\ &\le \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}}\sqrt{\sum_{i\in S^{k+1}\setminus T} \frac{|\left\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k\right\rangle|^2}{\|\mathbf{P}^\perp_{T^k}\phi_i\|_2^2}} \ (\because V^{k+1}\subset S^{k+1}\setminus T) \\ &\le \frac{\frac{1}{\sqrt{L}}\left\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{S^{k+1}\setminus T}\mathbf{r}^k\right\|_2}{\min_{i\in S^{k+1}\setminus T}\|\mathbf{P}^\perp_{T^k}\phi_i\|_2} \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Now, $\forall i \in S^{k+1}\setminus T$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{P}^\perp_{T^k}\phi_i\|_2^2 &= \|A_{T^k}e_i\|_2^2 \\ &\ge \left(1-\left(\frac{\delta_{Lk+1}}{1-\delta_{Lk+1}}\right)^2\right)\|\phi_i\|_2^2 \\ &= \left(1-\left(\frac{\delta_{Lk+1}}{1-\delta_{Lk+1}}\right)^2\right) \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{\sqrt{L}}\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{S^{k+1}\setminus T}\mathbf{r}^k\|_2\\
=&\frac{1}{\sqrt{L}}\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{S^{k+1}\setminus (T\cup T^k)}\mathbf{r}^k\|_2 \ (\because \mathbf{\Phi}^t_{T^k}\mathbf{r}^k=0)\\
\leq&\frac{1}{\sqrt{L}}\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{S^{k+1}\setminus (T\cup T^k)}\mathbf{\Phi}_{T\cup T^k}\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\|_2\\
\leq&\frac{1}{\sqrt{L}}\delta_{N-m_k+Lk+K-c_k}\|\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\|_2\\
\leq&\frac{1}{\sqrt{L}}\delta_{N+LK-1}\|\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\|_2 \qquad (29)
\end{aligned}$$

The last two steps follow from the observations $|(S^{k+1}\setminus(T\cup T^k))\cup(T\cup T^k)| = |S^{k+1}\setminus(T\cup T^k)| + |T\cup T^k| \leq |S^{k+1}\setminus T| + |T\cup T^k|$ and $m_k \geq 1,\ c_k \geq k,\ k \leq K$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
v_L \leq& \frac{1}{\sqrt{L\left(1-\left(\frac{\delta_{Lk+1}}{1-\delta_{Lk+1}}\right)^2\right)}}\delta_{N+LK-1}\|\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\|_2\\
<& \frac{1}{\sqrt{L\left(1-\left(\frac{\delta_{LK+N-1}}{1-\delta_{LK+N-1}}\right)^2\right)}}\delta_{N+LK-1}\|\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\|_2 \qquad (30)
\end{aligned}$$

Then $u_1 > v_L$ will be satisfied if we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{\sqrt{L\left(1-\left(\frac{\delta_{LK+N-1}}{1-\delta_{LK+N-1}}\right)^2\right)}}\delta_{N+LK-1}\|\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\|_2\\
&\qquad < \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}}(1-\delta_{LK+N-1})\|\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\|_2\\
\implies \sqrt{\frac{K}{L}} &\leq \frac{\sqrt{1-x^2}}{x} \quad \left(x := \frac{\delta_{LK+N-1}}{1-\delta_{LK+N-1}}\right) \qquad (31)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus (31) is satisfied under

$$\delta_{LK+N-1} < \frac{\sqrt{L}}{\sqrt{K+L}+\sqrt{L}} \qquad (32)$$

Thus we have the following theorem

Theorem 4.1. *m^2OLS can recover a K sparse vector $\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n$ perfectly from the measurement vector $\mathbf{y}=\mathbf{\Phi}\mathbf{x},\ \mathbf{y}\in\mathbb{R}^m,\ m<n$, if*

$$\delta_{LK+N} < \frac{\sqrt{L}}{\sqrt{K+L}+\sqrt{L}} \qquad (33)$$

is satisfied by matrix $\mathbf{\Phi}$.

Proof: If Eq. (33) is satisfied then Eq. (32) is satisfied due to monotonicity of δ from Lemma (2.1) and since $L \leq N$, Eq. (22) is also satisfied. ∎

V. Signal recovery using m^{2}OLS algorithm: in the presence of noise

The measurement model considered here is the following:

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{\Phi}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{e} \qquad (34)$$

where $\mathbf{e}$ is an unwanted noise vector. To characterize recovery performance of m^{2}OLS in the presence of noise, we use the following performance measures:

- $$snr := \frac{\|\mathbf{\Phi}\mathbf{x}\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{e}\|_2^2}$$
- minimum-to-average-ratio (MAR) [15],
$$\kappa = \frac{\min_{j\in T}|x_j|}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2/\sqrt{K}}$$

The following theorem establishes the requirement on snr under which m^{2}OLS is guaranteed to recover the true support set in K iterations.

Theorem 5.1. *Under the noisy measurement model described by Eq.* (34)*, m^2OLS is guaranteed to recover the true support set T in K iterations, if the sensing matrix $\mathbf{\Phi}$ satisfies equation* (33) *and the snr satisfies following condition:*

$$\sqrt{snr} > \frac{(\sqrt{N}+\sqrt{K})(1+\delta_{LK+N})\sqrt{K}}{\kappa\left(\sqrt{L(1-2\delta_{LK+N})}-\delta_{LK+N}\sqrt{K}\right)} \qquad (35)$$

A. Proof of Theorem. 5.1

1) Success at the first iteration: At the first iteration, the conditions for success are

$$S^1 \cap T \neq \emptyset$$
$$h^1 \cap T \neq \emptyset$$

Now, note that,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{S^1}\mathbf{y}\right\|_2\\
&\geq \min\left\{1,\sqrt{\frac{N}{K}}\right\}\left\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_T\mathbf{y}\right\|_2\\
&= \min\left\{1,\sqrt{\frac{N}{K}}\right\}\left\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_T\mathbf{\Phi}_T\mathbf{x}_T+\mathbf{\Phi}^t_T\mathbf{e}\right\|_2\\
&\geq \min\left\{1,\sqrt{\frac{N}{K}}\right\}\left[\left\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_T\mathbf{\Phi}_T\mathbf{x}_T\right\|_2-\left\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_T\mathbf{e}\right\|_2\right]\\
&\geq \min\left\{1,\sqrt{\frac{N}{K}}\right\}\left[(1-\delta_K)\|\mathbf{x}\|_2-\sqrt{1+\delta_K}\|\mathbf{e}\|_2\right]
\end{aligned}$$

If $S^1\cap T=\emptyset$, then,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{S^1}\mathbf{y}\right\|_2\\
&= \left\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{S^1}\mathbf{\Phi}_T\mathbf{x}_T+\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{S^1}\mathbf{e}\right\|_2\\
&\leq \delta_{N+K}\|\mathbf{x}\|_2+\sqrt{1+\delta_N}\|\mathbf{e}\|_2
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $S^1\cap T\neq\emptyset$ is guaranteed if

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_{N+K}\|\mathbf{x}\|_2+\sqrt{1+\delta_N}\|\mathbf{e}\|_2 < \min\left\{1,\sqrt{\frac{N}{K}}\right\}\cdot\\
\left[(1-\delta_K)\|\mathbf{x}\|_2-\sqrt{1+\delta_K}\|\mathbf{e}\|_2\right] \qquad (36)
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{T^1}\mathbf{y}\right\|_2 &\geq \sqrt{\frac{L}{K}}\left\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_T\mathbf{y}\right\|_2\\
&\geq \sqrt{\frac{L}{K}}\left[(1-\delta_K)\|\mathbf{x}\|_2-\sqrt{1+\delta_K}\|\mathbf{e}\|_2\right]
\end{aligned}$$

If $T^1 \cap T = \emptyset$, we have

$$\left\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{T^1}\mathbf{y}\right\|_2 \tag{37}$$
$$= \left\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{T^1}\mathbf{\Phi}_T\mathbf{x}_T + \mathbf{\Phi}^t_{T^1}\mathbf{e}\right\|_2$$
$$\leq \delta_{L+K}\left\|\mathbf{x}\right\|_2 + \sqrt{1+\delta_L}\left\|\mathbf{e}\right\|_2 \tag{38}$$

Hence, given that $S^1 \cap T \neq \emptyset$, $T^1 \cap T \neq \emptyset$ is guranteed, if

$$\delta_{L+K}\left\|\mathbf{x}\right\|_2 + \sqrt{1+\delta_L}\left\|\mathbf{e}\right\|_2 < \sqrt{\frac{L}{K}}\left[(1-\delta_K)\left\|\mathbf{x}\right\|_2 - \sqrt{1+\delta_K}\left\|\mathbf{e}\right\|_2\right]$$

If $N \leq K$, then from Eq. (36) and Eq. (38), the required conditions can be stated as:

$$\frac{\left\|\mathbf{x}\right\|_2}{\left\|\mathbf{e}\right\|_2} > \frac{\sqrt{K(1+\delta_N)}+\sqrt{N(1+\delta_K)}}{\sqrt{N}(1-\delta_K)-\delta_{N+K}\sqrt{K}}$$
$$\frac{\left\|\mathbf{x}\right\|_2}{\left\|\mathbf{e}\right\|_2} > \frac{\sqrt{K(1+\delta_L)}+\sqrt{L(1+\delta_K)}}{\sqrt{L}(1-\delta_K)-\delta_{L+K}\sqrt{K}}$$

Since, $L \leq N$, and we have here $N \leq K$, due to the monotonic increasing property of δ, both of the conditions above are satisfied if the following holds

$$\frac{\left\|\mathbf{x}\right\|_2}{\left\|\mathbf{e}\right\|_2} > \frac{\sqrt{1+\delta_{N+K}}(\sqrt{K}+\sqrt{N})}{\sqrt{L}-\delta_{N+K}(\sqrt{K}+\sqrt{L})} \tag{39}$$

If $N > K$, then from Eq. (36) and Eq. (38), we have

$$\frac{\left\|\mathbf{x}\right\|_2}{\left\|\mathbf{e}\right\|_2} > \frac{\sqrt{(1+\delta_N)}+\sqrt{(1+\delta_K)}}{(1-\delta_K)-\delta_{N+K}}$$
$$\frac{\left\|\mathbf{x}\right\|_2}{\left\|\mathbf{e}\right\|_2} > \frac{\sqrt{K(1+\delta_L)}+\sqrt{L(1+\delta_K)}}{\sqrt{L}(1-\delta_K)-\delta_{L+K}\sqrt{K}}$$

Now note that, $\sqrt{K}+\sqrt{N} \geq 2\sqrt{L}$, and $\sqrt{K}+\sqrt{L} \geq 2\sqrt{L}$, thus

$$\frac{\sqrt{K}+\sqrt{N}}{\sqrt{L}-\delta_{N+K}(\sqrt{K}+\sqrt{L})} \geq \frac{2}{1-2\delta_{N+K}}$$
$$> \frac{2}{1-\delta_K-\delta_{N+K}}$$

which implies that Eq. (39) is also a sufficient condition for success at the first iteration when $N > K$. Thus, from the definition of snr, it is easily seen that the preceeding condition holds true if the following holds:

$$\sqrt{snr} > \frac{(1+\delta_{N+K})(\sqrt{N}+\sqrt{K})}{\sqrt{L}-(\sqrt{L}+\sqrt{K})\delta_{N+K}} \tag{40}$$

2) Success at $(k+1)^{\text{th}}$ iteration: We assume that the previous k iterations have been successful, that is at least one correct index was found in each of the last k iterations. Denote $|T^k| = Lk$, $|T \cap T^k| = c_k$, so that $K > c_k \geq k$ Also, let $m_k := |S_k \cap T|$, $k \geq 1$, so that $m_i \geq 1$, $\forall i : 1 \leq i \leq k$. For the success of the $(k+1)^{th}$ iteration, we require

$$S^{k+1} \cap T \neq \emptyset$$
$$h^{k+1} \cap T \neq \emptyset$$

Condition to ensure $S^{k+1} \cap T \neq \emptyset$*:* To find the condition under which $S^{k+1} \cap T \neq \emptyset$ is satisfied, we use the following notation:

- $W^{k+1} := \underset{S \subset \mathcal{H} \setminus T:\ |S|=N}{\arg\max} \left\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_S \mathbf{r}^k\right\|_2^2$
- $\alpha^k_N := \min_{i \in W^{k+1}} \left|\left\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \right\rangle\right|^2$
- $\beta^k_1 := \max_{i \in T} \left|\left\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k \right\rangle\right|^2$

Clearly, $S^{k+1} \cap T \neq \emptyset$, if $\beta^k_1 > \alpha^k_N$. It is easy to see that

$$\alpha^k_N \leq \frac{\left\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{W^{k+1}}\mathbf{r}^k\right\|_2^2}{N}$$

Now, observe that

$$\mathbf{r}^k = \mathbf{P}^\perp_{T^k}\mathbf{y}$$
$$= \mathbf{P}^\perp_{T^k}\mathbf{\Phi}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{P}^\perp_{T^k}\mathbf{e}$$
$$= \mathbf{\Phi}_{T\cup T^k}\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k} + \mathbf{P}^\perp_{T^k}\mathbf{e}$$

which follows from equations Eq. (18) and Eq. (19). Then, it follows that

$$\alpha^k_N \leq \frac{1}{N}\left(\left\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{W^{k+1}\setminus T^k}\mathbf{\Phi}_{T\cup T^k}\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\right\|_2 + \left\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{W^{k+1}\setminus T^k}\mathbf{P}^\perp_{T^k}\mathbf{e}\right\|_2\right)^2$$

Now,

$$\left\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{W^{k+1}\setminus T^k}\mathbf{\Phi}_{T\cup T^k}\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\right\|_2 \leq \delta_{|(W^{k+1}\setminus T^k)\cup T\cup T^k|}\left\|\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\right\|_2$$
$$\leq \delta_{N+Lk+K-c_k}\left\|\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\right\|_2$$
$$\leq \delta_{N+LK}\left\|\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\right\|_2 \quad (\because 1 \leq k \leq c_k < K$$

and,

$$\left\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{W^{k+1}\setminus T^k}\mathbf{P}^\perp_{T^k}\mathbf{e}\right\|_2$$
$$\leq \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}\left(\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{W^{k+1}\setminus T^k}\mathbf{P}^\perp_{T^k}\mathbf{\Phi}_{W^{k+1}\setminus T^k}\right)}\left\|\mathbf{e}\right\|_2$$
$$\leq \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}\left(\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{W^{k+1}\setminus T^k}\mathbf{\Phi}_{W^{k+1}\setminus T^k}\right)}\left\|\mathbf{e}\right\|_2$$
$$\leq \sqrt{1+\delta_{N+Lk-m_{k+1}}}\left\|\mathbf{e}\right\|_2 \leq \sqrt{1+\delta_{N+LK}}\left\|\mathbf{e}\right\|_2$$

Thus,

$$\alpha^k_N \leq \frac{1}{N}\left(\delta_{N+LK}\left\|\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\right\|_2 + \sqrt{1+\delta_{N+LK}}\left\|\mathbf{e}\right\|_2\right)^2 \tag{41}$$

On the other hand,

$$\beta^k_1 \geq \frac{1}{K-c_k}\left\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{T\setminus T^k}\mathbf{r}^k\right\|_2^2$$
$$= \frac{1}{K-c_k}\left\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{T\cup T^k}\mathbf{\Phi}_{T\cup T^k}\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k} + \mathbf{\Phi}^t_{T\cup T^k}\mathbf{P}^\perp_{T^k}\mathbf{e}\right\|_2^2$$
$$\geq \frac{1}{K-c_k}\left(\left\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{T\cup T^k}\mathbf{\Phi}_{T\cup T^k}\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\right\|_2 - \left\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{T\cup T^k}\mathbf{P}^\perp_{T^k}\mathbf{e}\right\|_2\right)^2$$

Note that

$$\left\|\mathbf{\Phi}^t_{T\cup T^k}\mathbf{\Phi}_{T\cup T^k}\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\right\|_2 \geq (1-\delta_{Lk+K-c_k})\left\|\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\right\|_2$$
$$> (1-\delta_{LK+N})\left\|\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\right\|_2$$

(The last step follows because $Lk+K-c_k \leq (L-1)(K-1)+K < LK+N$)

and,

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\mathbf{\Phi}_{T\cup T^k}^t\mathbf{P}_{T^k}^{\perp}\mathbf{e}\right\|_2 &\leq \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}\left(\mathbf{\Phi}_{T\cup T^k}^t\mathbf{P}_{T^k}^{\perp}\mathbf{\Phi}_{T\cup T^k}\right)}\left\|\mathbf{e}\right\|_2\\ &\leq \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}\left(\mathbf{\Phi}_{T\cup T^k}^t\mathbf{\Phi}_{T\cup T^k}\right)}\left\|\mathbf{e}\right\|_2\\ &\leq \sqrt{1+\delta_{Lk-c_k+K}}\left\|\mathbf{e}\right\|_2\\ &< \sqrt{1+\delta_{LK+N}}\left\|\mathbf{e}\right\|_2\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\beta_1^k > \frac{1}{K-c_k}\left(\left(1-\delta_{LK+N}\right)\left\|\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\right\|_2 - \sqrt{1+\delta_{LK+N}}\left\|\mathbf{e}\right\|_2\right)^2 \tag{42}$$

Then, from equations Eq. (41), and Eq. (42), it follows that $S^{k+1}\cap T\neq\emptyset$ if

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{\sqrt{K-c_k}}\left(\left(1-\delta_{LK+N}\right)\left\|\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\right\|_2 - \sqrt{1+\delta_{LK+N}}\left\|\mathbf{e}\right\|_2\right)\\ &> \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\left(\delta_{N+LK}\left\|\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\right\|_2 + \sqrt{1+\delta_{N+LK}}\left\|\mathbf{e}\right\|_2\right)\end{aligned}$$

i.e. if

$$\frac{\left\|\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\right\|_2}{\left\|\mathbf{e}\right\|_2} \geq \frac{\sqrt{1+\delta_{LK+N}}\left(\sqrt{K-c_k}+\sqrt{N}\right)}{\sqrt{N}-\delta_{LK+N}(\sqrt{N}+\sqrt{K-c_k})} \tag{43}$$

Condition to ensure $h^{k+1}\cap T\neq\emptyset$*:* For the ease of the derivation, we use the following notation:

- $V^{k+1} = \underset{S\subset S^{k+1}\setminus T:|S|=L}{\arg\max}\sum_{i\in S}\frac{\left|\left\langle\phi_i,\mathbf{r^k}\right\rangle\right|}{\left\|\mathbf{P}_{T^k}^{\perp}\phi_i\right\|_2}$
- $u_1^k := \underset{i\in S^{k+1}\cap T}{\max}\frac{\left|\left\langle\phi_i,\mathbf{r^k}\right\rangle\right|}{\left\|\mathbf{P}_{T^k}^{\perp}\phi_i\right\|_2}$
- $v_L^k = \underset{i\in V^{k+1}}{\min}\frac{\left|\left\langle\phi_i,\mathbf{r^k}\right\rangle\right|}{\left\|\mathbf{P}_{T^k}^{\perp}\phi_i\right\|_2}$

Clearly, $u_1^k > v_L^k$ will ensure $h^{k+1}\cap T\neq\emptyset$. Now, note that

$$\begin{aligned}u_1^k &= \max_{i\in S^{k+1}\cap T}\frac{\left|\left\langle\phi_i,\mathbf{r^k}\right\rangle\right|}{\left\|\mathbf{P}_{T^k}^{\perp}\phi_i\right\|_2}\\ &\geq \max_{i\in S^{k+1}\cap T}\left|\left\langle\phi_i,\mathbf{r^k}\right\rangle\right|\\ &\geq \frac{\left\|\mathbf{\Phi}_{S^{k+1}\cap T}^t\mathbf{r}^k\right\|_2}{\sqrt{m_{k+1}}}\\ &\geq \frac{\left\|\mathbf{\Phi}_{T\setminus T^k}^t\mathbf{r}^k\right\|_2}{\sqrt{K-c_k}}\end{aligned}$$

Note that the penultimate step is allowed to write as $m_{k+1}\geq 1$ under condition of Eq. (43). Now, recalling that

$$\mathbf{r}^k = \mathbf{\Phi}_{T\cup T^k}\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k} + \mathbf{P}_{T^k}^{\perp}\mathbf{e}$$

one arrives at

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\mathbf{\Phi}_{T\setminus T^k}^t\mathbf{r}^k\right\|_2 &= \left\|\left[\mathbf{\Phi}_{T\setminus T^k}\ \ \mathbf{\Phi}_{T^k}\right]^t\mathbf{r}^k\right\|_2\\ &= \left\|\mathbf{\Phi}_{T\cup T^k}^t\left(\mathbf{\Phi}_{T\cup T^k}\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}+\mathbf{P}_{T^k}^{\perp}\mathbf{e}\right)\right\|_2\\ &\geq \left(1-\delta_{Lk+K-c_k}\right)\left\|\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\right\|_2 - \sqrt{1+\delta_{Lk-c_k+K}}\left\|\mathbf{e}\right\|_2\\ &\geq \left(1-\delta_{LK+N}\right)\left\|\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\right\|_2 - \sqrt{1+\delta_{LK+N}}\left\|\mathbf{e}\right\|_2\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$u_1^k \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{K-c_k}}\left[\left(1-\delta_{LK+N}\right)\left\|\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\right\|_2 - \sqrt{1+\delta_{LK+N}}\left\|\mathbf{e}\right\|_2\right] \tag{44}$$

On the other hand, from Eq. (27)

$$v_L^k \leq \frac{\frac{1}{\sqrt{L}}\left\|\mathbf{\Phi}_{S^{k+1}\setminus T}^t\mathbf{r}^k\right\|_2}{\min_{i\in S^{k+1}\setminus T}\left\|\mathbf{P}_{T^k}^{\perp}\phi_i\right\|_2}$$

Now, from Eq. (28), $\forall i\in S^{k+1}\setminus T$

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\mathbf{P}_{T^k}^{\perp}\phi_i\right\|_2^2 &\geq \left(1-\left(\frac{\delta_{Lk+1}}{1-\delta_{Lk+1}}\right)^2\right)\\ &\geq \left(1-\left(\frac{\delta_{LK+N}}{1-\delta_{LK+N}}\right)^2\right)\end{aligned}$$

and,

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\mathbf{\Phi}_{S^{k+1}\setminus T}^t\mathbf{r}^k\right\|_2\\ &= \left\|\mathbf{\Phi}_{S^{k+1}\setminus(T\cup T^k)}^t\mathbf{r}^k\right\|_2\\ &= \left\|\mathbf{\Phi}_{S^{k+1}\setminus(T\cup T^k)}^t\left(\mathbf{\Phi}_{T\cup T^k}\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}+\mathbf{P}_{T^k}^{\perp}\mathbf{e}\right)\right\|_2\\ &\leq \delta_{Lk+K+N-m_{k+1}-c_k}\left\|\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\right\|_2 + \sqrt{1+\delta_{N-m_{k+1}}}\left\|\mathbf{e}\right\|_2\\ &\leq \delta_{N+LK}\left\|\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\right\|_2 + \sqrt{1+\delta_{N+LK}}\left\|\mathbf{e}\right\|_2\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$v_L^k \leq \frac{\delta_{N+LK}\left\|\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\right\|_2 + \sqrt{1+\delta_{N+LK}}\left\|\mathbf{e}\right\|_2}{\sqrt{L\left(1-\left(\frac{\delta_{LK+N}}{1-\delta_{LK+N}}\right)^2\right)}} \tag{45}$$

From Eq. (44), and Eq. (45), the condition $h^{k+1}\cap T$ is ensured if

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{\sqrt{K-c_k}}\left[\left(1-\delta_{LK+N}\right)\left\|\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\right\|_2 - \sqrt{1+\delta_{LK+N}}\left\|\mathbf{e}\right\|_2\right]\\ &\geq \frac{\delta_{N+LK}\left\|\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\right\|_2 + \sqrt{1+\delta_{N+LK}}\left\|\mathbf{e}\right\|_2}{\sqrt{L\left(1-\left(\frac{\delta_{LK+N}}{1-\delta_{LK+N}}\right)^2\right)}}\end{aligned}$$

i.e. if,

$$\frac{\left\|\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\right\|_2}{\left\|\mathbf{e}\right\|_2} \geq \frac{\sqrt{(1+\gamma)(1+2\gamma)}\left(\sqrt{K-c_k}+\sqrt{L(1-\gamma^2)}\right)}{\sqrt{L(1-\gamma^2)}-\gamma\sqrt{K-c_k}} \tag{46}$$

where $\gamma := \frac{\delta_{LK+N}}{1-\delta_{LK+N}}$. So, from Eq. (43), and Eq. (46), one can write a sufficient condition for success at the $(k+1)^{th}$ iteration of gOMamOLS, given that iterations 1 through k are successful, as,

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{\left\|\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\right\|_2}{\left\|\mathbf{e}\right\|_2}\\ &\geq \sqrt{(1+\gamma)(1+2\gamma)}\cdot\\ &\max\left\{\frac{\sqrt{N}+\sqrt{K-c_k}}{\sqrt{N}-\gamma\sqrt{K-c_k}}, \frac{\sqrt{K-c_k}+\sqrt{L(1-\gamma^2)}}{\sqrt{L(1-\gamma^2)}-\gamma\sqrt{K-c_k}}\right\}\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\|_2 &\geq \left\|\mathbf{x}_{T\setminus T^k}\right\|_2 \\ &\geq |T\setminus T^k| \min_{j\in T}|x_j| \\ &= \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \cdot \kappa \cdot \sqrt{\frac{K-c_k}{K}}\end{aligned}$$

Since, by assumption, $c_k \leq K-1$, $\left\|\mathbf{x}'_{T\cup T^k}\right\|_2 \geq \kappa \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 / \sqrt{K}$, using the fact that $c_k \geq 0$, allows the following to be another sufficient condition for success at $(k+1)^{\text{th}}$ iteration,

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2}{\|\mathbf{e}\|_2}\frac{\kappa}{\sqrt{K}} \\ &\geq \sqrt{(1+\gamma)(1+2\gamma)}\cdot \\ &\max\left\{\frac{\sqrt{N}+\sqrt{K}}{\sqrt{N}-\gamma\sqrt{K}}, \frac{\sqrt{K}+\sqrt{L(1-\gamma^2)}}{\sqrt{L(1-\gamma^2)}-\gamma\sqrt{K}}\right\}\end{aligned}$$

Noting that $\|\mathbf{\Phi}x\|_2 \leq \sqrt{1+\delta_K}\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 < \sqrt{1+\delta_{LK+N}}\|\mathbf{x}\|_2$ and $N \geq L$, and putting the expression of γ, we find

$$\begin{aligned}&\sqrt{(1+\gamma)(1+2\gamma)}\frac{\sqrt{N}+\sqrt{K}}{\sqrt{N}-\gamma\sqrt{K}} \\ &= \sqrt{1+\delta_{LK+N}}\frac{\sqrt{N}+\sqrt{K}}{\sqrt{N}(1-\delta_{LK+N})-\delta_{LK+N}\sqrt{K}}\end{aligned}$$

Also note that

$$\begin{aligned}&\sqrt{(1+\gamma)(1+2\gamma)}\frac{\sqrt{K}+\sqrt{L(1-\gamma^2)}}{\sqrt{L(1-\gamma^2)}-\gamma\sqrt{K}} \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{1+\delta_{LK+N}}(\sqrt{K}+\sqrt{L(1-2\delta_{2K})})}{\sqrt{L(1-2\delta_{LK+N})}-\delta_{LK+N}\sqrt{K}} \\ &< \frac{\sqrt{1+\delta_{LK+N}}(\sqrt{K}+\sqrt{N})}{\sqrt{L(1-2\delta_{LK+N})}-\delta_{LK+N}\sqrt{K}}\end{aligned}$$

Now, since

$$\begin{aligned}&\sqrt{N}-(\sqrt{N}+\sqrt{K})\delta_{K+N} \\ &> \sqrt{N}-(\sqrt{N}+\sqrt{K})\delta_{LK+N} &(47)\\ &\geq \sqrt{L}(1-\delta_{LK+N})-\sqrt{K}\delta_{LK+N} &(48)\\ &\geq \sqrt{L(1-2\delta_{LK+N})}-\sqrt{K}\delta_{LK+N} &(49)\end{aligned}$$

we see that the following is another sufficient condition for success at the $(k+1)^{th}$ iteration,

$$\sqrt{snr} > \frac{(\sqrt{N}+\sqrt{K})(1+\delta_{LK+N})\sqrt{K}}{\kappa\left(\sqrt{L(1-2\delta_{LK+N})}-\delta_{LK+N}\sqrt{K}\right)} \quad (50)$$

Since this condition does not depend on k, condition in Eq. (50) is sufficient to guarantee success at all iterations $k \geq 2$. Furthermore, from Eq. (49), we see that under the condition in Eq. (50) the first iteration is also guaranteed to succeed.

Thus, from Eq. (40) and Eq. (50), we see that the overall sufficient condition for perfect recovery in K iterations is given by Eq. (50).

VI. Simulation results

In the simulation setup, two kind of measurement matrices are used. For one type of measurement matrix, for each entry, first i.i.d Gaussian random variables with zero mean and variance $1/m$ where m is the number of measurements and then they are normalized to 1 by dividing them by the norm of the corresponding column vectors. For the other kind of matrix, each element is chosen in the following way. A matrix $\mathbf{A}$ is constructed such that $a_{ij} = n_{ij} + t_j$ where $n_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1/m)$, $t_j \sim \mathcal{U}[0, T]$ and $\{n_{ij}\}$ are all i.i.d, t_i are all i.i.d and $n_{ij} \perp t_k \ \forall i, j, k$. We denote $\mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{a}_1\ \mathbf{a}_2\ \cdots\ \mathbf{a}_n]$ where $\mathbf{a}_i = [a_{1i}\ a_{2i}\ \cdots\ a_{mi}]^t$ are the columns of $\mathbf{A}$. Then the (i,j)th element of the matrix $\mathbf{\Phi}$ is constructed as $\phi_{ij} = a_{ij}/\|\mathbf{a}_j\|_2$. The size of the vector to be recovered is fixed to $n = 256$ and the sparsity is fixed to $K = 10$. We adopt the testing strategy of [4] where the number of measurements m is varied keeping n, K fixed and then for each (m, n, K) tuple the recovery probability is measured. The algorithms OMP, OLS and m^{2}OLS are run 1000 times for each tuple (m, n, K). The number of indices selected at an iteration by gOMP and mOLS inside the m^{2}OLS steps, are fixed to $N = 48, L = 3$. The performance of m^{2}OLS is compared to those of mOLS and gOMP, both allowed to select 3 indices at the identification step. Moreover the simulations were run for $T \in \{0, 4, 8\}$. The case $T = 0$ is the one where the measurement matrix has uncorrelated dictionary and the case $T = 4, 8$ correspond to measurement matrices with correlated dictionaries. We generate a $K = 10$ sparse signal with support randomly selected from $\{1, 2, \cdots, 256\}$ and the nonzero elements are randomly drawn from i.i.d Gaussian distribution.

Fig. 2 compares recovery probabilities of OMP,OLS and m^{2}OLS for different values of measurements, M and for different levels of correlated of the sensing matrix, by varying T. The simulations clearly indicate the superior performance of m^{2}OLS in terms of probability of reconstruction compared to gOMP. Specifically, it is to be noted that reconstruction performance of gOMP drastically reduces as the dictionary of the measurement matrix becomes increasingly correlated by increasing T. mOLS, in comparison to gOMP, does not deteriorate as much and since m^{2}OLS exploits the robustness of mOLS against correlated dictionaries, it is also quite robust to correlation in dictionary as far as reconstruction probability is concerned. Fig. 3 shows the variation of recovery probability against sparsity. The no. of measurements$M$ is kept fixed at 128. In Fig. 4, we have compared the number of iterations required by the three algorithms, for exact recovery, for different values T. In Fig. 5, mean runtime per iteration is plotted against sparsity for each of the three algorithms. For measuring the running times in the simulations we have used MATLAB program on a under 4-core-64-bit processor, 4 GB RAM and Windows 10 operating system. The simulations show that the running time of m^{2}OLS is much less than the running time of OLS and is closer to running time of OMP. This makes the m^{2}OLS a robust alternative of OLS with reduced computational complexity.



(a) $T = 0$



(b) $T = 4$



(c) $T = 8$

Fig. 2: Recovery probability vs number of measurements



(a) $T = 0$



(b) $T = 4$



(c) $T = 8$

Fig. 3: Recovery probability vs number of measurements



(a) $T = 0$



(b) $T = 4$



(c) $T = 8$

Fig. 4: No. of iteration for exact recovery vs sparsity



(a) $T = 0$



(b) $T = 4$



(c) $T = 8$

Fig. 5: Mean runtime per iteration vs sparsity

VII. Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper we have proposed a greedy algorithm for sparse signal recovery named m^{2}OLS which preselects a few possibly "good" indices using gOMP and then uses an mOLS step to identify indices to be included in the estimated support set. We have carried out a theoretical analysis of the algorithm using RIP and have shown that if the sensing matrix satisfies the RIP condition $\delta_{LK+N} < \frac{\sqrt{L}}{\sqrt{L}+\sqrt{L+K}}$, then the m^{2}OLS algorithm is guaranteed to exactly recover a K sparse unknown vector, satisfying the measurement model, in exactly K steps. Also, we have extended our analysis to the noisy measurement setup and analytically provided bounds on the measurement SNR, and the unknown signal MAR, under which recovery of the support of the unknown sparse vector is possible. Through numerical simulations, we have verified that introduction of the preselection step indeed facilitates faster index selection in identification step. Moreover, numerical experiments suggest that the recovery performance of m^{2}OLS in terms of recovery probability and number of iterations for success is very competitive with mOLS and has superior performance relative to gOMP, especially in correlated dictionaries. A future direction for this work could be to understand why exactly mOLS performs better than gOMP in presence of correlated dictionary and thereafter propose a further refinement of m^{2}OLS based on that exploration.

Appendix A
Proof of Lemmas

A. Lemma 4.1

Proof: At the $k+1$th step of m^{2}OLS the identification is performed by solving the following optimization problem

$$h^{k+1} = \underset{S\subset S^{k+1}:|S|=L}{\arg\min} \sum_{i\in S} \|\mathbf{P}^{\perp}_{T^k\cup\{i\}}\mathbf{y}\|_2^2$$

Let us use, for any support $T \subset \{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$, the following:

$$W_T = R(\mathbf{\Phi}_T)$$

where $R(A)$ denotes the *range space* or *column space* of matrix A i.e. the span of the columns of the matrix A. Then, $\mathbf{P}_{T^k}$ is the projection operator on the space W_{T^k}. Then,

$$W_{T^k\cup\{i\}} = \mathsf{span}\left(\phi_{i_1}, \cdots, \phi_{i_l}, \phi_i\right)$$

where $T_k = \{i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_l\}$. Then we can write

$$\begin{aligned} W_{T^k\cup\{i\}} =& \mathsf{span}\left(\phi_{i_1}, \cdots, \phi_{i_l}\right) \bigoplus \mathsf{span}\left(\mathbf{P}^{\perp}_{T^k}\phi_i\right) \\ =& W_{T^k} \bigoplus \mathsf{span}\left(\mathbf{P}^{\perp}_{T^k}\phi_i\right) \end{aligned}$$

where $\bigoplus$ denotes direct sum. Hence from properties of projection operator it follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_{T^k\cup\{i\}}\mathbf{y} &= \mathbf{P}_{T^k}\mathbf{y} + \frac{\left\langle \mathbf{P}^{\perp}_{T^k}\phi_i, \mathbf{y}\right\rangle}{\left\|\mathbf{P}^{\perp}_{T^k}\phi_i\right\|_2^2}\mathbf{P}^{\perp}_{T^k}\phi_i \\ \implies \mathbf{P}^{\perp}_{T^k\cup\{i\}}\mathbf{y} &= \mathbf{P}^{\perp}_{T^k}\mathbf{y} - \frac{\left\langle \mathbf{P}^{\perp}_{T^k}\phi_i, \mathbf{y}\right\rangle}{\left\|\mathbf{P}^{\perp}_{T^k}\phi_i\right\|_2^2}\mathbf{P}^{\perp}_{T^k}\phi_i \\ \implies \left\|\mathbf{P}^{\perp}_{T^k\cup\{i\}}\mathbf{y}\right\|_2^2 &= \left\langle \mathbf{P}^{\perp}_{T^k\cup\{i\}}\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{P}^{\perp}_{T^k\cup\{i\}}\mathbf{y}\right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{P}^{\perp}_{T^k\cup\{i\}}\mathbf{y}\right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{P}^{\perp}_{T^k}\mathbf{y} - \frac{\left\langle \mathbf{P}^{\perp}_{T^k}\phi_i, \mathbf{y}\right\rangle}{\left\|\mathbf{P}^{\perp}_{T^k}\phi_i\right\|_2^2}\mathbf{P}^{\perp}_{T^k}\phi_i\right\rangle \\ &= \left\|\mathbf{P}^{\perp}_{T^k}\mathbf{y}\right\|_2^2 - \frac{\left|\left\langle \mathbf{P}^{\perp}_{T^k}\phi_i, \mathbf{y}\right\rangle\right|^2}{\left\|\mathbf{P}^{\perp}_{T^k}\phi_i\right\|_2^2} \\ &= \left\|\mathbf{P}^{\perp}_{T^k}\mathbf{y}\right\|_2^2 - \frac{\left|\left\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{P}^{\perp}_{T^k}\mathbf{y}\right\rangle\right|^2}{\left\|\mathbf{P}^{\perp}_{T^k}\phi_i\right\|_2^2} \\ &= \left\|\mathbf{P}^{\perp}_{T^k}\mathbf{y}\right\|_2^2 - \frac{\left|\left\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k\right\rangle\right|^2}{\left\|\mathbf{P}^{\perp}_{T^k}\phi_i\right\|_2^2} \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\forall S \subset S^{k+1} : |S| = N$,

$$\sum_{i\in S}\left\|\mathbf{P}^{\perp}_{T^k\cup\{i\}}\mathbf{y}\right\|_2^2 = N\left\|\mathbf{P}^{\perp}_{T^k}\mathbf{y}\right\|_2^2 - \sum_{i\in S}\frac{\left|\left\langle \phi_i, \mathbf{r}^k\right\rangle\right|^2}{\left\|\mathbf{P}^{\perp}_{T^k}\phi_i\right\|_2^2}$$

from which the second part of the claim is established.

To prove the first part, we prove the following claim, from which the result will follow immediately:

Lemma 1.1. *Let $\{a_1, \cdots, a_n\}$ be a set of n positive real numbers, where $n \geq 1$. Let $[n] := \{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$. Let $1 \leq K \leq n$ be a positive number. Let*

$$h = \underset{S:|S|=K, S\subset[n]}{\arg\max} \sum_{i\in S} a_i$$

and

$$H = \underset{S:|S|=K, S\subset[n]}{\arg\max} \sum_{i\in S} a_i^2$$

Then, $\sum_{i\in h} a_i = \sum_{i\in H} a_i$.

Proof: We first show that $\min_{i\in H} a_i \geq \max_{i\in[n]\setminus H} a_i$. Assume that this is not true. Then, $\exists i \in H, j \in [n] \setminus h$, such that $a_i < a_j$ and consequently $a_i^2 < a_j^2$. Then, we can form a new set $H' = H \cup \{j\} \setminus \{i\}$, with the sum of a_i^2's on the set as $\sum_{k\in H'} a_k^2 = \sum_{k\in H} a_k^2 - a_i^2 + a_j^2 > \sum_{k\in H} a_k^2$, which contradicts the fact that $\sum_{k\in H} a_k^2$ is maximal.

Thus, $\sum_{i\in H} a_i \geq K \min_{i\in H} a_i \geq \sum_{j\in h} a_j$. Also, by assumption, $\sum_{i\in H} a_i \leq \sum_{j\in h} a_j$. Thus the claim follows. ■ ■

B. Lemma 4.2

Proof:

Let $N \leq K$. Then, according to the definition of S^1, for all $\Lambda \subset T$, such that $|\Lambda| = N$,

$$\left\|\mathbf{\Phi}_{S^1}^t \mathbf{y}\right\|_2^2 \geq \left\|\mathbf{\Phi}_{\Lambda}^t \mathbf{y}\right\|_2^2$$

Since there are $\binom{K}{N}$ such subsets of T, labelled, $\Lambda_i,\ 1 \leq i \leq \binom{K}{N}$, we have

$$\binom{K}{N} \left\|\mathbf{\Phi}_{S^1}^t \mathbf{y}\right\|_2^2 \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\binom{K}{N}} \left\|\mathbf{\Phi}_{\Lambda_i}^t \mathbf{y}\right\|_2^2 \tag{51}$$

Now, take any $j \in T$, and note that it appears in one of the Λ_i's in exactly $\binom{K-1}{N-1}$ different ways. Thus, from the summation in Eq. (51), we find,

$$\begin{aligned} \binom{K}{N} \left\|\mathbf{\Phi}_{S^1}^t \mathbf{y}\right\|_2^2 &\geq \binom{K-1}{N-1} \left\|\mathbf{\Phi}_{T}^t \mathbf{y}\right\|_2^2 \\ \implies \left\|\mathbf{\Phi}_{S^1}^t \mathbf{y}\right\|_2^2 &\geq \frac{N}{K} \left\|\mathbf{\Phi}_{T}^t \mathbf{y}\right\|_2^2 \end{aligned}$$

From which Eq. (3) follows.

Now, let $N > K$. Then, we can take any subset $\Sigma \subset \{1, 2, \cdots,\ n\}$, such that $|\Sigma| = N$ and $T \subset \Sigma$. Then, from definition, $\left\|\mathbf{\Phi}_{S^1}^t \mathbf{y}\right\|_2^2 \geq \left\|\mathbf{\Phi}_{\Sigma}^t \mathbf{y}\right\|_2^2 \geq \left\|\mathbf{\Phi}_{T}^t \mathbf{y}\right\|_2^2$ from which Eq. (4) follows.

To prove Eq. (5), first note that T^1 consists of indices corresponding to the largest L absolute values $|\langle \boldsymbol{\phi}_i, \mathbf{y} \rangle|^2$, for $i \in S^1$. But since S^1 consists of indices corresponding to the N largest absolute values $|\langle \boldsymbol{\phi}_i, \mathbf{y} \rangle|^2$ with $i \in \{1, 2, \cdots,\ n\} =: \mathcal{H}$, and since $N \geq L$, we have, $\min_{i \in T^1} |\langle \boldsymbol{\phi}_i, \mathbf{y} \rangle|^2 \geq \max_{i \in \mathcal{H} \setminus T^1} |\langle \boldsymbol{\phi}_i, \mathbf{y} \rangle|^2$. Since, $L \leq K$, for each $\Gamma \subset T$, such that $|\Gamma| = L$, we have

$$\left\|\mathbf{\Phi}_{T^1}^t \mathbf{y}\right\|_2^2 \geq \left\|\mathbf{\Phi}_{\Gamma}^t \mathbf{y}\right\|_2^2$$

Since there are $\binom{K}{L}$ such subsets, we can write

$$\binom{K}{L} \left\|\mathbf{\Phi}_{T^1}^t \mathbf{y}\right\|_2^2 \geq \sum_{\Gamma : \Gamma \subset T,\ |\Gamma| = L} \left\|\mathbf{\Phi}_{\Gamma}^t \mathbf{y}\right\|_2^2$$

Now any index $i \in T$ is contained in exactly $\binom{K-1}{L-1}$ of such L cardinality subsets. Hence

$$\binom{K}{L} \left\|\mathbf{\Phi}_{T^1}^t \mathbf{y}\right\|_2^2 \geq \binom{K-1}{L-1} \left\|\mathbf{\Phi}_{T}^t \mathbf{y}\right\|_2^2$$

from which Eq. (5) follows. ■

REFERENCES

[1] E. J. Candès, J. Romberg, and T. Tao, "Robust uncertainty principles: Exact signal reconstruction from highly incomplete frequency information," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 489–509, 2006.

[2] S. S. Chen, D. L. Donoho, and M. A. Saunders, "Atomic decomposition by basis pursuit," *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 33–61, 1998.

[3] G. Davis, S. Mallat, and M. Avellaneda, "Adaptive greedy approximations," *Constr. Approx.*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 57–98, 1997.

[4] J. A. Tropp and A. C. Gilbert, "Signal recovery from random measurements via orthogonal matching pursuit," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 53, no. 12, pp. 4655–4666, 2007.

[5] S. Chen, S. A. Billings, and W. Luo, "Orthogonal least squares methods and their application to non-linear system identification," *Int. J. Control*, vol. 50, no. 5, pp. 1873–1896, 1989.

[6] B. K. Natarajan, "Sparse approximate solutions to linear systems," *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 227–234, 1995.

[7] J. Wang, S. Kwon, and B. Shim, "Generalized orthogonal matching pursuit," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 60, no. 12, pp. 6202–6216, 2012.

[8] J. Wang and P. Li, "Recovery of Sparse Signals Using Multiple Orthogonal Least Squares," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1410.2505*, Oct. 2014.

[9] D. L. Donoho, Y. Tsaig, I. Drori, and J.-L. Starck, "Sparse solution of underdetermined systems of linear equations by stagewise orthogonal matching pursuit," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 1094–1121, 2012.

[10] D. Needell and R. Vershynin, "Signal recovery from incomplete and inaccurate measurements via regularized orthogonal matching pursuit," *IEEE J. Sel. Topics Signal Process.*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 310–316, 2010.

[11] D. Needell and J. A. Tropp, "Cosamp: Iterative signal recovery from incomplete and inaccurate samples," *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 301–321, 2009.

[12] W. Dai and O. Milenkovic, "Subspace pursuit for compressive sensing signal reconstruction," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 55, no. 5, pp. 2230–2249, 2009.

[13] C. Soussen, R. Gribonval, J. Idier, and C. Herzet, "Joint k-step analysis of orthogonal matching pursuit and orthogonal least squares," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 5, pp. 3158–3174, 2013.

[14] S. Satpathi, R. L. Das, and M. Chakraborty, "Improving the bound on the rip constant in generalized orthogonal matching pursuit," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 20, no. 11, pp. 1074–1077, 2013.

[15] A. K. Fletcher and S. Rangan, "Orthogonal matching pursuit: A brownian motion analysis," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 60, no. 3, pp. 1010–1021, 2012.